



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## ART. VIII. — CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. — *The Mythology of the Aryan Nations*. By GEORGE W. COX, M. A., late Scholar of Trinity College, Oxford. In two volumes. London. 8vo. 1870.

IN this work Mr. Cox has followed up a beginning which he made some years ago (1867) with his little "Manual of Mythology." The latter, in its brevity and one-sidedness, hardly merited so large a name ; and it was somewhat overpraised by the adherents of the special school to which it belonged, and by those who take their cue from them. The present is a much more ambitious and elaborate effort ; and it well deserves, as it will doubtless receive, general and careful attention. An American reprint of it has been announced by the same house — Leypoldt and Holt, New York — that brought out the "Manual" in this country. It is the extreme working-out, in one direction, of a tendency in mythological study, which has been for some time growing in force, and has quite recently made itself very conspicuous ; the tendency, namely, to shift the basis of investigation of any special mythology within the circle of the Indo-European family to the more general ground of Indo-European mythology ; to treat it as a developed branch of an older stock, requiring comparison with the other branches from the same stock ; at once to expand the field and to change and deepen the methods of mythologic research. This tendency began to show itself with the first establishment of Indo-European unity, and was its necessary result. When once it was impregnably demonstrated that a single community had laid the foundation of Greek, Latin, Celtic, Germanic, Slavic, Iranian, and Indian language, and had developed that language to a high degree of structural perfection, under traceable conditions of culture which were far in advance of utter barbarism, the inference was a natural one, that the same community must have developed, also, a common religion ; that is to say, that it must have arrived at certain apprehensions of the nature of the powers existing and at work in the world outside of man ; of their modes of action and their connection with man ; of man's relation to them, his origin, duties, and destiny, and must have framed some common expression, by word, myth, and ceremony, of its religious views ; and that, accordingly, some relics of this primitive faith might be plausibly looked for among the early beliefs and myths of the Indo-European nations ; just as relics of their ancient tongue had been discovered, abundant and unmistakable, in even their most modern idioms. Of course only

investigation could show whether the presumed relics were actually to be found ; and, if found, of what extent and value they would prove to be ; and whether any one people would appear to have saved so much of the faith once shared by all, that it would offer, as it were, a key to the whole. But there were indications lying upon the very surface, which awakened hope of abundant results to reward the investigator. Thus, to refer to only one or two of the most conspicuous, quoted by way of illustration a hundred times, — the correspondence of *deus* and *θεός* with the Sanskrit *devas*, and of *Jupiter* and *Ζεύς*(*πατήρ*) with the Sanskrit *Dyu*(*pitar*), taken in connection with the fact that *dyu* in Sanskrit signified unequivocally the bright “sky,” or the shining “day,” and that *deva*, its regular derivative, meant “shining” or “heavenly,” was like the outcrop of a rich vein, tempting the miner to explore its hidden depths. And those who entered upon the investigation soon convinced themselves that ancient India had preserved the primitive conditions with a faithfulness which was in vain to be sought elsewhere. On the one hand, the Sanskrit language offered in general, as in the examples just quoted, the clearest explanation of those names, to know which is often to know the things themselves. On the other hand, the very earliest recorded period of Indian antiquity, the Vedic, wore an aspect almost to be called Indo-European. The former was to be expected, considering the recognized exceptional value of the Sanskrit as a means of Indo-European etymological research ; but the other was in no wise its necessary accompaniment and counterpart ; it was rather a special and exceptional piece of good fortune for the student. Indeed, by the time that Indian history had fairly begun, the state of things was entirely changed ; while the classical Sanskrit retained most of its Vedic primitiveness, the religion which it expressed had gone further from the old Indo-European basis than the Greek, for example, ever went. It is because hardly even the germs of the distinctive institutions of India are to be found in the Vedas, that these are so fertile of illustration for the ante-historical, Indo-European period.

Every Vedic student, then, became, almost of necessity, a student of primitive religions and a comparative mythologist. He could not help setting side by side what he found in the Veda and the analogous facts from other quarters of the world, within or without the Indo-European domain, and trying to make the one explain the other. The general theory of the early stages of religious development made rapid advance, and a host of points in the special history of Indo-European religions were brought clearly to light. Some scholars have been more active in this direction than others. Burnouf, Roth, and Kuhn were very prominent among the early investigators, and of these Kuhn has

worked most continuously and most deeply. The names of others, whose activity is more recent or less effective, we need not stay to mention.

The solidity of the basis which these men have established, and the real value of the results they have built upon it, are beyond all reach of denial or cavil. The conclusions of the comparative mythologists are, within their narrow limits, not less firm than those of the comparative philologists; and they require to be carefully heeded by all who would study any part of Indo-European antiquity. When such a new field of pertinent material is thrown open, he is an unfaithful worker who does not resort to it. It is no longer possible to undertake the interpretation of Greek myths, for example, from Greek sources alone, any more than to study Greek derivations without regard to the other Indo-European tongues. There runs a constant analogy between these two departments of inquiry, and we are all the time tempted to draw upon the one for the illustration of the other. The root of a word is like the natural phenomenon in which a myth or personification takes its origin. If the latter is to be fully understood, the former must be traced out or approached as nearly as may be. Either word or myth may have become the embodiment of special national life and feeling, to any degree; it may be, for example, instinct with the very spirit of Greek individuality; it may have so racy and local a flavor as to seem to have grown up out of the soil of Hellas; and yet it contains an inheritance from an older time, and its present aspect is the final result of a history of change and adaptation, which has to be read or our comprehension of it is imperfect. Behind the splendid pageant of Greek mythology, as behind the wonderful development of Greek speech, there lies a past of a very different character, bare and even poor in its simplicity, possessing few attractions, save for the historical student, though for him replete with the highest interest. And of that past a more faithful picture is to be found in India than the most careful and cunning search can catch and set forth from the records of the hoariest Greek antiquity. The natural conservatism of classical scholars long resisted the intrusion of the new light from the East in grammar and etymology; but the contest is now nearly over; the comparative method, through the whole extent of Indo-European speech, is acknowledged as the only true and fertile one; and the time is doubtless not far distant when the same accordance will be reached in the department of mythology and religion.

But if the main principle of the comparative method is thus sound, the details of its application are more intricate and questionable. When we come to inquire how much and what the Vedic hymns teach respect-

ing the origin of Greek myths, there is room for all the differences of individual capacity and tendency to manifest themselves. No such bright and convincing light is cast, that he who runs may read and that error is impossible. The ante-mythical period is more fully illustrated and the mode in which myths originate made more distinctly apprehensible. Some names are explained, and many hints toward direct interpretation are given; hardly more. Nothing stands in the way of exaggeration and abuse on the part of the upholders of the new method. Here, again, the parallelism with the study of language is close and instructive. When the Sanskrit was first brought in to the aid of Indo-European philology, there were not a few who overrated its importance, who applied it where it was not pertinent, who set it up as supreme where it should have stood second, who, without profound knowledge or critical method, were ready to solve every obscure or doubtful question by reference to a Sanskrit dictionary. The influence of such advocates was, of necessity, hurtful to the cause they espoused, strengthening the aversion of all who were inclined to shut their eyes to the new light; but for the aid and comfort thus given to the enemy, the contest would have been sooner and more absolutely settled. In a like manner, the Vedas have been, and will be, handled as a kind of spell for clearing up the darkness of Indo-European antiquity; their myths and germs of myths strained far beyond what they will bear as means of interpretation, or pressed into the service of some favorite theory; Indian material of late growth and doubtful authenticity treated as primitive, and what is exclusively Hindu put forward as belonging to the whole family. Continued study, the consenting labor of many minds, and conscientious criticism, will by degrees correct these aberrations, and save the true method, with the grand principles it involves, even out of the hands of those whose ill-judged advocacy does it present harm.

In the study of which we have thus concisely and imperfectly sketched the basis, the labors of Professor Max Müller have made a new era. His article on Comparative Mythology, in the "Oxford Essays" for 1856 (reproduced in the second volume of his "Chips from a German Workshop"), made a great sensation among English readers on both sides of the Atlantic, being to many the revelation of a field of research of which the possibility had been before unsuspected. Some of its themes he elaborated more fully in the second volume of his "Lectures on the Science of Language"; and his "Chips" contain other essays of kindred character and object. The principal significance of his work lies in two directions. In the first place, he set forth, in his peculiarly happy style, with attractive eloquence and rich and varied illustration,

the leading principles of the study, drawing toward them the public attention in a manner and to a degree that was within the reach, probably, of no other living writer. To regard him, however, as the father and founder of a new science (as many, especially in England, seem inclined to do) is an injustice to the great scholars who were his predecessors. He cannot fairly be claimed even to have deepened and strengthened its basis. It is precisely in his fundamental views that he is most open to adverse criticism, as being at variance with the approved tendencies of the science of the day. His assumption of a special religious faculty in man, a primitive intuition of the infinite and divine, an innate craving and recognition of a heavenly Father, instead of a capacity to see the Creator in the works of creation, a power to feel and be impressed by the supernatural, and to rise, by constant observation, comparison, and inference, higher and higher in the apprehension of spiritual truth, is not greatly different from the old assumption of a primitive revelation, with the later religions as its alterations and debasements, which he himself contends against, and would fain refute. It inverts the true order of development, putting that at the starting-point which ought to be the goal. In accordance with this, he looks upon monotheism as earlier than polytheism, and even goes so far as to find an antecedent and underlying recognition of one God in the simple naturalism of the old Vedic faith, — a radical perversion, in the opinion of most students of the Veda, of its real meaning. Müller, too, believes in a corruption and depravation of earlier and purer doctrines as the ordinary course of development in religion; but he is original in making the *word* the instrument of the depravation. His peculiar views of the way in which men have blundered into error on the most vital points of belief, through simple forgetfulness of the proper meaning of the terms they were using, have been already noticed and combated in the pages of this Review, and need not be dwelt upon here. They stand in legitimate connection with his theory as to the general relation of language to mind and thought. To him, the word is not the servant and instrument of the thought, but the thought itself, and speech is reason; so that errors of speech naturally turn to unreason. No one will think of denying that such errors play their part in the grand history of the aberrations of the human mind; but that part is far from being the leading one which Müller claims. Coming down from religion to mythology, the same tendency to exaggeration of the word is seen in his theory of "mythical phrases," as the germs of developed myths, in which, we are convinced, that whatever is new is ill-founded. So long as a phrase is the real expression of a conception of its utterer, so long it has a living force within

itself, and is capable of growing into something else; but the moment it becomes a phrase merely, it is dead, and can only drop into oblivion.

The other and the more striking and original part of Müller's work lies in his actual contributions to the interpretation of myths; in the details of his application of the principles of comparative mythologic study; in the way in which he has turned Vedic elements to account for the explanation of points, especially in Greek mythology, hitherto obscure or wrongly treated. He has brought forward into the first rank of importance two personifications, of the sun and of the dawn, of which comparatively little has been made before, and has furnished a series of certainly very brilliant and attractive interpretations. The number of mythical figures under which he finds these two natural phenomena, and of mythical situations representing their various relations, mutual or other, is quite surprising. He is himself startled at it, and asks whether it can be, after all, that everything is the dawn or the sun. We may, indeed, question a part of his identifications; we may regard some of his combinations as implausible, and criticise here and there an etymology as over-venturesome; we may, in brief, think that he has a hobby and rides it too hard; yet we cannot refuse him the credit of having thrown open and exploited a vein of which his predecessors had failed to discover the wealth, and given a new and promising turn to the whole subject of mythical interpretation.

A striking feature in this part of Müller's work is the extent to which he resolves the early mythical history and heroic tradition into purely mythical elements. Common opinion has heretofore inclined to see in those grand figures which loom up on the threshold of a nation's story as it lies in the nation's mind, veritable men, only magnified and adorned by the admiration of posterity. Even the gods have been taken for deifications. Better and deeper knowledge, however, has long been turning the minds of students of antiquity in the other direction, and showing them that beings of supernatural origin are drawn to earth and made men of, by excess of anthropomorphism, much more often than the contrary. Müller has only carried this tendency further than his predecessors; startling, for example, the classical scholar by maintaining that even the war of Troy is only a form of the contest waged in the East to recover the treasures of which the powers of darkness have robbed the day in the West; that Helen is the dawn, and Achilles a solar figure, in whose beauty and prowess, in whose wrath and sullen retiracy, in whose triumph and vengeance, in whose brief career and early death, are to be seen merely one set of variations of the theme which has engaged bard and poet since the first dawn of the poetic faculty.

There were two ways, now, of continuing the work thus begun by Müller. It might be gone over again, in a thoroughly independent and critical spirit, by some one possessed of learning and acuteness enough to test it in all its parts, examining the alleged basis of Indo-European mythical fancy laid before us in the Veda; weighing anew the value of the prominent elements there, and tracing out their development by the livelier fancy of the Greeks; striving after such a comprehensive view of both as should bring their relations into clearer light; questioning identifications and correcting etymologies. Or, on the other hand, its leading ideas and methods might be taken up and pushed on by one whose whole soul was possessed by them, with the single design of seeing how far they could be carried, and how much could be brought within their reach.

To return, then, to the work which formed the starting-point of this exposition (and of which we are more solicitous to point out clearly the position and connections than to give a detailed and exhaustive criticism), Mr. Cox, it cannot be questioned, has followed the latter of these two ways, or, rather, his mind has been taken possession of by Müller's researches, and he cannot help urging them forward with all his powers. We do not often meet with so implicit a disciple, so enthusiastic a sectary. All that Müller has said upon the subject is to him the law and the gospel; each of the master's opinions is taken up and dwelt upon, and illustrated and worked out by the pupil, with a hearty assent and admiration, which are not a little interesting to see. Mr. Cox does not feel that there can be any real doubt, or need be any serious discussion of the principal points involved in Müller's theories. To him, they are already supported by an array of evidence "which will not long hence be regarded as excessive"; and they need only to be stated and illustrated in order to be received by others with the same delighted conviction with which his own mind has accepted them.

Probably there are few who will go this whole length with Mr. Cox. Many, rather, will be in some measure repelled by the fervor of his advocacy, which will seem to them more indicative of obsequiousness of mind than of independent critical judgment. We must take his work, however, for what it is, and we shall not fail to find much to admire in it, and to gain from it valuable light. There is always something winning in the earnestness of full persuasion, and the assent of many, and the interest of more, will be carried onward by the mere force of the author's current. His volumes are doubtless more picturesque, sparkling, and readable than if his nature had been cooler and his style more scientific. Mr. Cox's mind, like his master's, hardly has the scientific habit; it is rather genial, imaginative, constructive. In his early chap-



ters, it is true, he commends and urges the scientific method; but he does not define it, or show us its foundation; and he does not exemplify it, if it demands, besides a faithful resort to every available source of evidence, a calm and dispassionate judgment, unbiassed by a favorite theory, and a logical and orderly plan, a progress from one established point to another. It were useless to attempt giving an analysis of the contents of the book, which is a gush of exposition and illustration of one leading idea in various forms, and, in part, seems to have been divided into chapters by an afterthought. An extract of twenty pages almost anywhere would furnish a kind of ideal section of the whole, showing all its different strata of thought and argument, and yielding specimens of its staple constituents. In a work so written there cannot but be a great deal of repetition; and we imagine that from this a full third might be removed without omitting anything. The same myth is explained over and over again, with varying fulness; objections are answered half a dozen times; and difficulties already laid to rest arise once more to vex our souls and to be exorcised anew. A facility of ornate and eloquent expression is the author's most conspicuous quality; and it is less held in check and guided by logical closeness and accuracy than were to be desired. He lays no claim to original scholarship, excepting in the classical department of his subject; and he is neither too careful in the selection of the sources on which he relies nor too conscientious in using them. In matters of etymology he is least of all trustworthy. Take, for example, his statement (I. 171) that "Argynnis and Phorôneus, Briséis and Achilleus, Paris and Helen, names of persons in Hellenic legend, are in the earliest songs of the Aryan family found still in their original application as names of the morning, of the sun, or of darkness." Here are a number of Müller's most venturesome conjectures, which he himself puts forth with diffidence, elevated into first-rate facts. The first two of the names quoted are somewhat doubtfully identifiable with certain common adjectives in Sanskrit, which have not in the least the character of appellatives, though, as meaning "shining," and the like, variously applicable to the phenomena of light. To explain Briséis, we have twice in the Veda the word *Br̥saya*, as name of a (male) demon apparently. To Achilleus the Veda furnishes no correspondent whatever, and it is only by setting sound etymology at defiance that it can be brought into even distant connection with anything found there. And as for Paris and Helen, their oneness with the *pāṇi*'s and Saramâ (the former, in the Veda, the thieves of Indra's kine, the latter his messenger to reclaim them), is very far from being established; even Müller holds it but doubtfully; and it will take, we think, a much stronger

internal probability than can be made out for the identification to overcome the external difficulties, in the forms of the words compared. And because *ahanâ* occurs once in the Veda as an epithet of the dawn, of wholly doubtful meaning and derivation, though, but for its lack of *d*, identifiable with *dahanâ*, which has a derivation, and might well enough also have been applied to the dawn, but is not; therefore to Mr. Cox (Preface, p. x), "the affinity of *Athênê* with the Sanskrit *Ahanâ*, and *Dahanâ* and the Greek *Daphnê*, is so clear that Liddell and Scott are to be seriously blamed for not admitting it into their Greek lexicon as a satisfactory etymology. And if he suggests a new etymology of his own, it is some such impossibility as the correspondence of the Latin *Consus* and the Sanskrit *Gaṇeṣa*. (I. 347, note.)

Nor is Mr. Cox always mindful of consistency in the interpretation he gives to mythic elements. The poisoned robe of *Dejanira*, in which *Hercules* expires, is sometimes (c. g. p. 56) the mantle of cloud in which the sun sinks to rest at the close of the day; at other times (c. g. I. 56 again!), it is the representation of "the piercing rays which burn in the tropical noonday"; and yet again (I. 66, note), the boar's tusk, which cuts short the life of *Adonis*, "and reappears in the myth of *Odysseus*, is but the thorn of winter and poisoned robe of *Heracles*." The "thorn of winter," namely, because the death of summer, under the baleful influence of winter, is not only inseparably connected with the overwhelming of day by night, so that either can be substituted for the other to help out an interpretation, but the destroying power is most fitly represented by the fatal weapon which wounds the hero in his one vulnerable spot. It is the arrow that pierces the heel of *Achilles*; it is the sword which is thrust into *Siegfried's* back; it is the spindle that pricks the finger of the maiden shut up in the tower; it is the poisoned fragment of finger-nail that the malignant dwarfs have left in the crack of the door; and various other things. Mr. Cox's circle of comparisons is a wide one, and sometimes brings together strange bedfellows. Thus (I. 410, note), the gray-haired chief in Scott's ballad of *Erlinton*, who alone is left alive to tell the tale, and the immortal sisters of the slain snake-haired *Medusa*, and *Phrixos* who lives on while *Hellê* dies, and the youngest child of *Kronos*, who is not swallowed, and the youngest goat (in Grimm's story of the *Wolf and the Seven Little Goats*), whom the wolf does n't eat, are all the same thing, and brought in in connection with the trials of *Cupid and Psyche*. And (II. 330, note) the burning up of *Blue-Beard* in his own house, with all his wealth and accomplices, "is manifestly the destruction of *Ilion*," — *Blue-Beard*, like *Paris*, being a power of darkness, that steals dawns, or *Helens*, till he meets with one who is too cunning for him,

and brings about his destruction, — a form of the myth, we would suggest, that seems to have grown up within the Arctic circle, as the only quarter of the world where the twilight sometimes gets the better of night altogether.

This extreme extension of the ground of mythologic research and comparison is one of the specialties of Mr. Cox's system, although here, as elsewhere, he is only pushing boldly forward where Müller had led the way. To him, the *Odyssey* has but the same story to tell as the *Iliad*; it is the sun, wandering and suffering through his ten hours of toil, while the powers of darkness, the suitors, worry and distress the bride — the dawn — whom he left at evening, and whom he will find again, as young and fair as ever, when he returns in early morning. The German *Nibelungen Lied* is palpably the same tale, under another aspect. Arthur and Roland came out of no other crucible. And yet, further, the tales and stories with which we made acquaintance in childhood are solar and dawning in their essential texture; wherever there is an irresistible hero doing wonderful deeds, it is the sun; where there is a lovely damsel waiting for a deliverer, it is the dawn, expectant of the return of the great luminary after his day's toil or his night's eclipse. But the heroes of a humbler class are of the same lineage: Boots, and the Shifty Lad, and Jack the Giant-killer, and doubtless Tom Thumb, although we do not remember his name in the list. Mr. Cox has drawn up (in various places; most briefly and comprehensively, perhaps, at I. 43, 44) a scheme of the elements which may enter into a solar myth, or of the "mythical phrases," in which the Indo-Europeans of the earliest age must have incorporated their impressions of "the daily or yearly course of the lord of day," and which afterwards, when the proper sense of the terms used had been forgotten, grew up into a wild luxuriance of myth and story. Wherever, now, he detects the presence of any of these, there he is ready to assume that a solar myth lies hidden. And we have seen, by the examples cited, how keen is his sense for such prey, and with what slight indications he is satisfied. We should call it easy credulity, if it did not merit a better name. He is, in fact, wholly possessed by his theory; he has established in his own mind so immense an antecedent probability in favor of this mode of interpretation of heroic incident, that he is prepared to find occasion for it everywhere. The general community of scholars, however, we believe, will long continue sceptical, and will only yield its assent, if yield it must, to a cooler and more logical advocate. They will not readily believe that the ancient Indo-European people treated this one theme with such an exuberant fertility of imagination as nearly to exhaust themselves upon it, and to sing and tell of nothing else. They

will not believe that elements originally mythical had such an exceptional power of self-preservation and propagation, that even those who, for thousands of years had entirely lost the underlying mythical sense, could not but reproduce them with faithful iteration. The correspondences, in parts, of the nursery and narrative literature of many nations of Europe and Asia are, indeed, very remarkable; and it remains to be determined, by comprehensive and wary inquiry, how much of them is accidental or due to the like working out of tendencies common to all human nature, how much is the result of transmission from one people to another, and how much, if any, is to be traced to a common tradition from the remote ages of unity. We cannot consent to have the whole question settled for us in advance so summarily.

Mr. Cox's method palpably invites to burlesque and caricature. We might almost say that he himself sets us the example of caricaturing it, so exaggerated is, in many cases, his valuation of the coincidences which he thinks to find, so great his ingenuity in discovering them where no one else would have suspected their existence. An instance is his exposition (I. 151, ff.) of the story of Ahmed, as told by Irving in the "Alhambra"; it is much too long to repeat here; but we could hardly ask a better model to follow, if we would learn the art of interpreting stories into solar myths. And caricatures have begun to appear; hardly any critic of the work has been able to refrain from them; the most elaborate and artful one we have seen, worked out with immense ingenuity and learning, and with a surprising command of countenance, is found in No. 5 of "Kottabos" (an organ of the erudition and wit of Trinity College, Dublin), where Max Müller himself is proved to be a solar myth, and one as compared with which "few are so detailed and various; and, perhaps, there is none which brings together, in so concentrated a focus, the special characteristics of Sanskrit, Hellenic, and Norse fable." We, on our part, see capabilities in General Grant, from which we refrain our hands only unwillingly. His famous resolution, "to fight it out on this line, *if it takes all summer*," has the true solar ring, announcing a myth of the northern variety, where the yearly instead of the daily career of the orb of day is the theme; and if we add the long winter of inaction and fruitless effort before Richmond, and the final resistless outbreak and conquest, as soon as the vernal equinox was past, we have a more than usually abundant capital of evident solar elements with which to begin our interpretation.

But though we may permit ourselves a laugh at Mr. Cox's exaggerations, we ought to laugh good-humoredly, and without refusing him our full respect as an earnest scholar and a powerful and ingenious writer. His work deserves, as we have said, to be widely studied; and

it will do valuable service, doubtless, in advancing the cause he has at heart, if only by exciting public attention and stimulating research and discussion, which shall tend toward the final establishment of truth. Under and along with the exaggerations, we, for our part, are confident that there is a great deal which is solid and valuable.

Only a part of the preparatory work needful to be done in order to make the Veda yield its full harvest of results for Indo-European antiquity has been yet accomplished. When the internal content of that venerable document shall have been as thoroughly laid open as its speech has been analyzed, and shall have engaged the labors of as many careful students, we may hope, not, perhaps, for so abundant and certain results as some are even now promising themselves, and hastening forward to gather, but, at least, much more than is now within our reach, and enough to more than repay all that it shall cost. Just at present, tilling should be more the occupation of the day than reaping; and we cannot help regarding such works as the great St. Petersburg Sanskrit lexicon (now nearly completed) and Muir's Original Sanskrit Texts (especially the last published volume, "Contributions to a Knowledge of the Cosmogony, Mythology, Religious Ideas, Life, and Manners of the Indians of the Vedic Age"), as more likely than any others to do permanent service to the study of the mythology of the Aryan nations.

2. — *Classical Study: Its Value illustrated by Extracts from the Writings of Eminent Scholars.* Edited with an Introduction by SAMUEL H. TAYLOR, LL. D., Principal of Phillips Academy. Andover : Warren F. Draper. 12mo. 1870. pp. xxxv and 381.

THIS work is one of the good fruits of the discussion again going on in regard to the methods and instruments of education, and every one interested in this important subject, and taking wise views of it, will be grateful for this contribution towards the enlightenment of the general mind. The volume consists of essays and discourses, presented entire or in part, from the pens of accomplished scholars, some of them being professors, others politicians and lawyers, prefixed to which is an excellent Introduction by Dr. Taylor.

We are much struck by the elevated and catholic character of these papers. Ranging over a period of near half a century, and written by the avowed friends of classical learning, they all wisely and generously advocate, some in express words, others by implication, the interests of every department of learning as essential to the full and harmonious development of all the powers of the mind. They advocate the study